

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2
3 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

4 * * *

5 YUNG LO, Case No. 2:12-cv-01887-APG-PAL
6 v. Plaintiff,
7 ETT GAMING, et al.,
8 Defendants.

9
10 ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
11 MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
12 (ECF No. 76)

13 Plaintiff Yung Lo moves for reconsideration of my prior order dismissing her complaint.
14 “Reconsideration is appropriate if the district court (1) is presented with newly discovered
15 evidence, (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) if there is
an intervening change in controlling law.” *Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah Cnty., Or. v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1263 (9th Cir. 1993). A district court also may reconsider its decision if “other,
highly unusual, circumstances” warrant it. *Id.*

16 Lo does not identify any change in the law or newly discovered evidence to support
17 reconsideration. She has not shown my prior order was clearly erroneous or manifestly unjust.
18 Nor are there any highly unusual circumstances warranting reconsideration. Despite numerous
19 opportunities, Lo did not file an amended complaint as directed. Even her motion for
20 reconsideration does not attach a proposed amended complaint. Lo thus presents no basis to
21 reconsider.

22 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiff Yung Lo’s motion for reconsideration
23 (ECF No. 76) is DENIED.

24 DATED this 6th day October, 2016.

25
26 
27 ANDREW P. GORDON
28 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE